

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
STATESVILLE DIVISION
5:06cv47**

J. G. ASSOCIATES, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
Vs.)	ORDER
)	
GREYSTONE SERVICING)	
CORPORATION, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

THIS MATTER is before the court on the Certification and Report of Initial Attorneys Conference filed June 15, 2006, and upon a general review of the pleadings. Counsel have attached to the CIAC a proposed “Stipulation and Protective Order” as well as exhibits. As reflected in the CIAC, counsel requests that the proposed Order be granted to facilitate discovery. Typically, the court will not grant relief unless it is preceded by a motion as provided by Local Rule 7.1. While the court can see the need for a protective order, it must be based on some showing. Further, the practice of an Order following a motion is required under ECF inasmuch as there simply is no method for tracking “attachments” or requests for relief contained in documents captions as anything less than a motion. While counsel may certainly attach a proposed Order to a motion, the court prefers use of CyberClerk, which allows for a more accurate replication of the proposed Order.

Reviewing the docket further for compliance with the Local Rules, it appears that respective counsel have failed to comply with Local Rule 73.1(A), concerning consent to jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c). In accordance with Local Rule 73.1(B), respective counsel are now advised that they should comply as soon as possible inasmuch as case assignment will impact the entry of an appropriate Pretrial Order and Case Management Plan

ORDER

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that “Attachment “1 to the CIAC (#5) is **STRICKEN** as not supported by a motion. Further, respective counsel shall comply with Local Rule 73.1 within 10 days of receipt of this Order.

Signed: June 20, 2006

Dennis L. Howell

Dennis L. Howell
United States Magistrate Judge

